DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 438 PS 008 848

AUTHOR Harrold; Jeralyn D.

TITLE Day Care Licensing Improvement Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Social Services, Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 76
GRANT OCD-CB-510
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Certification; Child Care Centers; Data Collection; *Day Care Services; Demonstration Programs; *Family Day Care; Historical Reviews; *Professional Training; *Program Descriptions; Records (Forms); Staff Improvement; State Action; *State Licensing Boards; State Supervisors; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Day Care Licensing; *Family Day Care Registration; Michigan

ABSTRACT

This progress report evaluates the Day Care Licensing Improvement Project (Jan. 1, 1974 - Dec. 31, 1975) designed by the Michigan Department of Social Services. The four project objectives are reported on. Projects dealt with developing and improving licensing procedures through public education and by training licensing consultants in order to upgrade the level of care in family day care homes and day care centers, and evaluating the registration process, a variant to the licensing of family day care homes. The document contains the interim report of the Demonstration Project for the Registration of Family Day Care Homes and the Staff Resource Library Bibliography, an outgrowth of the licensing training program. The interim report deals with the historic development of day care and day care regulation; registration, overview, process and significance; development, training and planning to study registration as possibly a more appropriate type of regulatory process than the licensing method; methods of comparing licensing and registration; findings and recommendations. Data tools are appendixed. (BF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129438

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

DAY CARE LICENSING IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Grant No: OCD-CB-510

Project Director: Harold S. Gazan
Principal Investigator: Geralyn D. Harrold
Project Assistant: Jacqueline A. Wood

PS 008848

Bureau of Regulatory Services
Michigan Department of Social Services
300 South Capitol Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48926

FINAL REPORT

DAY CARE LICENSING IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

OCD-CB-510

Background

Child day care is and has been the fastest growing child welfare service in Michigan today. The number of children needing out-of-home care for part of a day has heightened the demand for day care centers and day care homes. Since 1970, the number of licensed day care centers has increased from 750 to over 1500, a 100% increase in six years. There has been a similar but less dramatic increase in the number of family day care homes, an increase of 2,000 homes for a total of 10,300.

At the time this Project began, the day care licensing process was based on a 29-year old statute. That statute did not specifically define nor refer to day care facilities. In addition, there were no specific licensing rules for family day care homes; these homes were being licensed by utilizing the foster home licensing rules and were referred to as "part-time" foster homes. A group day care home had not been conceived. And lastly, the licensing requirements regulating day care centers have not been revised for 15 years.

Therefore, to assure that all children placed in out-of-home day care settings are provided with basic quality care that genuinely safeguards children and to effect licensing as a truly preventive service, a new child care licensing law, Act 116, PA 1973, was enacted in August, 1973 and became effective on March 29, 1974. This legislation paved the way for improving the regulation of child day care centers and day care homes.

Purpose of the Project

The Day Care Licensing Improvement Project was designed to enable the Department to accomplish the following:

A. Expand the number of children covered by regulation through the development of

licensing rules for programs not currently regulated:

1. Drop-in child care centers
2. Infant/Toddler day care centers
3. Night-time child care centers
4. School-age child care centers
5. Group day care homes

B. Upgrade the floor level of care by revising and reformulating current licensing rules for:

1. Family day care homes
2. Day care centers

C. Improve the licensing/consultation aspect of the regulatory process by:

1. Training licensing consultants.
2. Public education on the purpose and value of licensing.

D. Demonstrate and evaluate in three select counties a variant to the licensing of family day care homes, registration.

The purpose of this component to DCLIP is to demonstrate whether or not the registration of family day care homes is a viable, effective alternative to licensing family day care homes. Licensing, to be effective, must have community support and ample staff to effectively evaluate and inspect family day care homes, to be uniform with rule application, and to be consist with implementation. When any one of these factors is missing, licensing becomes ineffectual.

Project Design and Timetable

The Project staff consisted of three people: 1) Harold S. Gazan, Project Director; 2) Jeralyn D. Harrold, Principal Investigator; 3) Jacqueline A. Wood, Project Assistant. An Advisory Committee was established to assist in the development of certain aspects of the Project, and most particularly with the design of the registration of family day care homes demonstration component of this Project.

The Project began on January 1, 1974 and ended December 31, 1975 after approved extensions.

Project Progress

With regard to the four objectives of the Project outlined in the purpose, there has been significant progress with each objective including two objectives having been fully achieved.

The Ad Hoc Committee for the revision of child care center rules met regularly during the first year of the Project. From late fall, 1974 through spring of 1975, the draft set of revised rules was refined to include more relevant requirements for "drop-in" centers. After Department review and approval, more than 10,000 copies of the proposed child care center licensing rules were distributed to individuals and groups in the State. Based on comments received at four public hearings, the proposed rules were again revised. Now after final Department review and approval, the last phase of the promulgation process will begin. Final promulgation is expected in the fall of 1976. This proposed set of licensing rules for child care centers include regulations for infant/toddler, preschool, and school-age care, drop-in care, and nighttime care. It will be the most comprehensive set of licensing rules for child care centers that the State of Michigan has ever had.

With the implementation of the current child care licensing law, Act 116 (PA 1973), in March of 1974, the group day care home was officially created. The promulgation process for licensing rules for group day care homes has been at a standstill. Currently, there are six licensed group day care homes in the state. It is expected that emergency rules will be promulgated in 1976; at the

same time that emergency rules are promulgated, an Ad Hoc Committee as required by law will be formed. There will be a one-year time period within which the Ad Hoc Committee and the Department must act to complete the final promulgation of licensing rules for group day care homes.

During the Project period, there were two major thrusts in family day care home regulation. The first was the promulgation of licensing rules expressly for family day care homes. The second was the development of the demonstration project for the registration of family day care homes. Both activities occurred concurrently. On July 1, 1975, the newly promulgated licensing rules for family day care homes were implemented as was the registration project. A copy of the interim report on the Registration Project which was presented to the Michigan Legislature in February, 1976, is attached (Appendix A). The Day Care Licensing Improvement Project supported several days of expert consultation on registration from Mrs. Lela Costin, The Jane Addams School of Social Work, University of Illinois, and from Mr. Norris Class.

The training program for licensing specialists, supervisors, and administrators was the most exciting component of the Day Care Licensing Improvement Project. There were six major training efforts. Staff training workshops or conferences were led by nationally recognized experts such as Norris Class, Gertrude Binder and Edna Hughes.

The first training effort was in September, 1974, when Norris Class spent five days in Michigan with State Office administrative and supervisory staff. The second and third components were licensing retreat conferences for child care centers licensing specialists (November, 1974) and for day care home licensing specialists and selected county workers (January, 1975). The fourth effort was a specialized workshop in enforcement (adverse action, complaint taking, and suppression of illegally operating facilities) for State office administrators and supervisors. The fifth and most comprehensive training effort was a three-day conference for licensing specialists, supervisors and administrators.

The last activity was the establishment of staff training library for all licensing personnel with books, periodicals, pamphlets on regulatory administration, administrative law, child development, child psychology, child care, family home care. A copy of the staff library bibliography is attached (Appendix B). The library is utilized by

individual licensing specialists for professional development as well as for training workshops that they lead. The administrative and supervisory staff use the library for reference and for development in state-wide training.

Summary

The Project afforded the Michigan Department of Social Services an opportunity to tap resources it ordinarily would not have been able to use. It permitted the Department to invite nationally known experts in regulatory administration for training and consultation. It enabled the development of an impressive and complete staff training resource library. The Project permitted us to expand the Registration Project so that we have learned more about registration than we might have. It also opened up communication with many States with whom we had not previously interacted through the training interaction with consultants.

The grant was timely. It came to Michigan when day care was growing at an intensive rate, when day care regulation was beginning to gain state and national recognition, and when Michigan had recently passed a new, innovative and comprehensive child care licensing statute.

In summary, The Day Care Licensing Improvement Project provided opportunities for tremendous growth experiences for the Department's day care licensing staff -- administrators, supervisors, and specialists.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Interim Report: Demonstration Project for the Registration of Family Day Care Homes

Appendix B Staff Resource Library Bibliography

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

FOR THE

REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

(INTERIM REPORT)

FEBRUARY 12, 1976

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
DSS Publication # 289 (2-76)

Foreword

The need to regulate facilities in which children are placed for out-of-home care has been well documented and responded to in the form of licensing laws by all states. But, it has not been clear as to what is the most appropriate means of regulation which should be used for family day care homes. The general intent of this project has been to shed light on just this very question. The report is both a description of our State's attempt to demonstrate registration and to provide the legislation with a preliminary summary of our findings as to the effectiveness of registration.

While the focus of the demonstration project is the State of Michigan, the implications of the results have national interest.

I am most grateful to Jeralyn Harrold, project director. Her leadership was characterized by professionalism and conscientiousness resulting in a well designed project I wish to also acknowledge the contributions of Jacqueline Wood, who served as project assistant and gave so generously of her time and talents and enabled the project to move along so successfully. I wish also to recognize the contributions of Dr. Reginald Carter; with his researcher's perspective, he enabled the project to maintain a required objectivity.

While the results of the project are only of a preliminary nature and cover too brief a time to have any validity for decision making, the report does clearly describe the project and underscores the need to continue it through this calendar year.

Harold S. Gazan
February 10, 1976

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Background

Across the nation, states have been raising the questions as to whether licensing is the most effective method of regulating family day care homes. The estimate by national experts indicates that approximately 10% to 15% of the family day care homes currently operating are licensed. Therefore, registration of family day care homes has been proposed as a possible viable alternative to licensing by child care regulatory experts such as Norris Class, Edna Hughes and Gwen Morgan.

In Michigan family day care homes are private homes in which one but not more than six unrelated minor children, unattended by a parent or legal guardian, are given care and supervision for periods of less than 24 hours per day.

The Michigan Legislature authorized the Department of Social Services to conduct in up to 3 counties. a demonstration project of the registration of family day care homes. The authorization is stated in Section 9 of Act 116, P.A. 1973. This paper is a report of the Project findings and recommendations as required by Act 116, P.A. 1973.

Registration as a method of regulating family day care homes is defined in Act 116, P.A. of 1973, as the process whereby the Department maintains a record of all family day care homes, promulgates rules and requires the person operating a family day care home to certify that he or she has complied with the rules. The family day care home provider self-certifies substantial compliance at the time of registration and, as a result of being registered, will have consultative resources available to him or her for interpretive and educational information regarding child care. The registration is in effect for 2 years from the date of issuance or until the expiration of the project period.

Project Design

The purpose of the Registration Project is to study registration as possibly a more appropriate type of regulatory method than is licensing from the operational viewpoint of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy. The primary hypotheses to be tested are:

H.1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving care in regulated family day care homes than the licensing counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of regulated homes having rule violations than the licensing counties.

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or a lower expenditure of funds per home regulated than the licensing counties.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

Planning for the Project began in the Winter of 1974 with the delegation of staff and the selection of an Advisory Committee. A sample was selected consisting of 6 Michigan counties, four experimental counties and two control counties matched by demographic characteristics. Approximately 1900 family day care homes, licensed or registered to care for 6,350 children, are included in the six-county sample. Six county Department of Social Services regulatory units containing a total of 18 department personnel are also included in the six-county sample.

The six sample counties are divided into three groups. Each group is composed of two counties. Two groups serve as experimental counties and one group serves as the control counties. Each group is currently conducting one of the following regulatory approaches:

Experimental Group I (Kalamazoo and Midland) - Registration including the two components of training and public information.

Experimental Group II (Washtenaw and Marquette) - Licensing with training and public information components identical to those of registration.

Control Group (Ingham & Shiawassee) - Licensing as currently practiced in Michigan.

The Project was implemented on July 1, 1975, after a delay of six months as a regult of the length of time necessary to promulgate a set of administrative rules for family day care homes. The delay, however, allowed for one year of pre-data to be collected, thus giving a base line of county regulatory activity in the Project counties prior to implementation of registration. Pre-data was collected on a quarterly basis. Project data, also collected quarterly, is tentatively scheduled to be gathered for one and a quarter years. Thus fare, three months of project data has been collected. This report is based upon an analysis of two data months, as data for the third month has not yet been received.

Descriptive data is gathered on each county's regulatory activities through forms and questionnaires sent to regulatory workers and family day care home providers. Data collection focuses on the number of homes regulated; provider attitudes; inquiries about family day care; complaints related to family day care homes; rule violations; number of children in care; cost per regulated home; and demographic information. Following the collection of data, a comparison of means between the experimental and control groups is used as the statistical treatment.

Findings and Recommendations

Findings to date are based on two months of project data as compared to a year of pre-data; thus, the conclusions can only be considered tentative at this time. The preliminary findings do suggest that the registration process results in a higher number of homes regulated than does licensing and that providers show a greater willingness to become registered. The findings also show that registration has incurred moderate costs (e.g., higher than the control group's costs, but lower than the enriched licensing group) because of public information and informational newletter mailings to providers. A preliminary negative finding of registration when compared to licensing is that the percentage of registered homes in violation of one or more administrative rules is greater than the percentage of licensed homes in violation.

It is the recommendation of this report that the Project be continued for one year to enable the Department to gather additional comparative data between licensing and registration and to explore the long range consequences of the registration process.

The final results of this Project have both state and national importance. Michigan is currently the only state in the nation doing a comparison of the two regulatory approaches of registration and licensing. Some states, while having changed from licensing to the registration of family day care homes, have conducted no studies to determine whether registration is, in fact, a more effective approach to regulating family day care homes than is licensing.

If the Project continues, it is the Department's intention to present a final report to the Legislature no later than March 1, 1977. The final report will include the Department's recommendation as to which method is most effective for regulating family day care homes in Michigan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES..... i

CHAPTERS

1. Historic Development of Day Care and Day Care Regulation..... 1
2. Registration and Its Significance..... 4
3. Project Development..... 6
   A. Initial Planning..... 6
   B. Information and Training Components..... 8
   C. Overview of the Registration Process..... 10
   D. County Selection..... 12
   E. Planning Difficulties..... 16
4. Methods..... 19
5. Findings..... 22
6. Conclusion and Recommendations..... 32

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Project Staff..... 34
Appendix B - The Caregiver..... 35
Appendix C - Media Pamphlet..... 36
Appendix D - Data Tools..... 39

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... ii

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of Homes Regulated..... 23

Table 2. Number of Child Slots..... 24

Table 3. Estimated Number of DSS Children Cared For..... 25

Table 4. Number of Homes Having Violation of Rules..... 27

Table 5. Costs (Pre Project Data)..... 29

Table 6. Costs (Project Data)..... 30

Chapter 1. HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF DAY CARE AND DAY CARE REGULATION

The group care of children for part of a day began over a century ago when the first day care center in America was established in New York City in 1854.[1] This center and other early established day care centers were founded to care for children of poor working mothers, to prevent child neglect and to deter the need for institutionalization. The care given was basically physical care with children fed and protected from only "obvious" hazards. This substandard child care went generally unnoticed by the public. However, during the latter part of the 19th century, there was an increased awareness of and demand for state regulation and inspection of 24-hour care foster homes and orphanages. During the first half of the twentieth century as a result of the World Wars and the Depression, the number of working women increased and the number of day care facilities expanded. By 1937, 37 states had passed licensing laws.[2]

In Michigan, the first legislation relating to regulatory activities of child caring facilities was Act 41 of P.A. 1899. This Act required any incorporated society, association and organization receiving and maintaining minor children in institutions or placing minor children in homes to keep records and to make certain reports. It also permitted the state to make "official inspection". (Act 42 of 1899 prohibited non-incorporated societies, associations, organizations or persons from receiving, maintaining or placing minor children in homes.)[3]

1 Norris Class, "Public Policy and Working Mothers: A Historical Analysis of the American Experience," Annual Lecture on Public Policy Issues, p. 1.

2 Lela B. Costin, Child Welfare: Policies and Practice, p. 305.

3 Michigan Public Acts, 1899, No. 41 and No. 42. p. 61-62.

Although Act 41 permitted state inspection by the State Board of Corrections and Charities, it was not until 1913 when Act 300 (P.A. 1913) was passed that Michigan had its first licensing law.[4] The introduction to Act 300 states that it is

> "An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of persons. societies, organizations. associations or corporations engaged in the business of receiving, maintaining or placing out minor children and prescribing the duties and compensation of county agents."

The Act required an investigation of the methods of doing business, the applicant's character and fitness to provide for care and have custody of children and to operate a facility. Rules and regulations were to be developed and prescribed. A penalty for violation of the Act was set; the penalty was similar to the penalty in the current child care licensing law.

Six years later, in 1919, the Legislature passed Act 136 which provided for the licensing and regulation of boarding homes. In this Act, a boarding house was defined as a person who has in his custody or control for a period longer than 30 days, 1 or more children under 15 years unrelated to him by blood or marriage for the purpose of providing care, food and lodging. Rules and regulations were established and state inspection to determine "suitableness of the home" was mandated.[5]

Act 47 of P.A. 1944 continued the regulation of child placing agencies, child caring institutions and foster homes. This Act expanded the licensing and regulation responsibility to include day care centers, children's camps, homes for unmarried mothers and homes caring for children for less than 24 hours per day (known as part time foster home). This licensing law also contained greater specificity regarding the licensing process.[6]

During the 29 years between Act 47 (P.A. 1947) and the current licensing statute, Act 116 (P.A. 1973), the establishment of day care facilities mushroomed

[4] Ibid, 1913, No. 300, p. 573.

[5] Ibid, 1919, No. 136, p. 248.

[6] Ibid, 1944, No. 47, p. 89.

across the nation and in Michigan. The growth of day care has been attributed to three main factors: (1) more women were entering the work force; (2) a new emphasis and interest was placed on a child's development during the formative years of his life; and (3) the passage of federal legislation (Head Start, Title I, Title 4) during the 1960's.

Act 116 (P.A. 1973), the current licensing legislation, clearly defines the eight types of child caring organizations and the functional aspects of the licensing process. In addition, it contains many innovative aspects such as the authority to provide consultation, the mandate to involve the community in the development of rules, the requirement to inform the public about the law and the need for licensing. The statute also expands the regulatory jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services to include governmental as well as non-governmental child caring organization, thereby removing a possible double standard between the two sectors. The demonstration project of the registration of family day care homes is outlined in Section 9 of this Act. The controversy and reasons for the inclusion of the registration project are described in Chapter 2 of this paper.

In summary, the state inspection of child care facilities in Michigan began in 1899 with state regulation beginning in 1913. Refinement and expansion of the regulation and inspection of child care facilities have evolved to the present legislation, Act 116 (P.A. 1973).

Chapter 2. REGISTRATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

State agencies responsible for the administration of day care licensing have found that the regulation of day care centers differs considerably from the licensing of family day care homes.[7] Many states have been able to regulate all or nearly all of the day care centers. The centers have been regulated so that children are safeguarded, the public accepts the state's responsibility to assure an acceptable level of care, and the number of staff and expenditure of money are reasonable.

The experience with family day care home licensing has been different. In a 1970 Day Care Survey done by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research Inc., it was reported that a minimum of 987,000 children are cared for in family day care homes with 85% of these children cared for year-round.[8] Gwen Morgan, a national regulatory specialist, estimates that only 5% - 10% of the family day care homes in the United States are licensed.[9] Many states are examining how to better regulate the currently licensed homes and how to extend the regulatory process to those homes operating illegally so that children in family day care homes can be more appropriately safeguarded. The states, through this examination process, are seeking ways to improve their regulatory programs so that all family day care homes can be regulated in a fair and equitable manner and so that parents share the responsibility with the state and the provider of protecting their children while these children are in another person's home.

Although there has been no significant research in the area, Gwen Morgan in her publication, Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children, states some possible reasons why family day care homes are not coming forward to be

[7] Gwen Morgan, Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children, p. 1a.
[8] Ibid, p. 1b.
[9] Ibid, p. 1b.

licensed. The first reason is that public information of the need to be licensed has not been significant. Many people do not know about the licensing law or the licensing rules. Secondly, licensing appears to be complicated, expensive and threatening. Persons providing family day care fear the inspection of their private homes and the questioning of their child rearing and housekeeping practices. There is concern about reporting the minimal day care income to the Internal Revenue Service. The community has observed little or no enforcement of the licensing law and persons wonder why they need to be licensed while others can manage to avoid licensing.[10]

Nationally, the regulatory administration experts have begun discussing an alternative type of regulation for family day care homes known as "registration." In licensing, the applicant must do something in advance of caring for children with the regulatory agency making a determination of conformity to rules. If conformity exists, the agency gives offical permission to operate (e.g., a license). In registration, the process to gain the official permission to operate is much less complicated. In Michigan, the registration applicant self-certifies his compliance with rules and is given a Certificate of Registration without prior agency determination of rule conformity.

The enforcement of registration relies heavily on community awareness and involvement. It calls for every parent whose child is in a day care home to be given a copy of the rules and a method for reporting complaints of alleged substandard care. The community is also informed of the need for persons to register, the registration agency's location and the method for reporting concerns or complaints. Registration utilizes the community's involvement to share the enforcement responsibility.

[10] Ibid, p. 11-13.

Chapter 3. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

A. Initial Planning

With the Michigan Legislature's passage of Act 116, P.A. 1973, the Department of Social Services commenced the initial planning steps for the implementation of a registration demonstration. Registration was to be studied over a two-year period as possibly a more appropriate type of regulatory process for family day care homes than the currently used licensing method.

One of the beginning planning steps taken by the Department was the delegation of State Office staff to develop, implement, and conduct the Project (Appendix A). As a support to the staff, an Advisory Committee to the Registration Project was established with representation from the Michigan 4-C Council, the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Social Services County Staff, Department of Social Services Office of Children and Youth Services, and the Department of Social Services Planning and Coordination Unit. Functionally, the committee added breadth to the development and design of the Project by expanding the Project's focus through exploration of alternatives.

Input gained from Advisory Committee discussions assisted the Family Day Care Home Regulatory staff to begin implementation of the mandate of Act 116. P.A. 1973. Another beginning step of implementation was the development of administrative rules for family day care homes. An Ad Hoc Committee was convened in February, 1974, and the promulgation process began.

Previously, family day care in Michigan was viewed as parttime foster care; both family day care homes and foster family homes were regulated by the administrative rules for foster homes. Thus, none of the differences between foster care and family day care were addressed in the licensing rules. Act 116, P.A. 1973, permitted these differences to be addressed through the promulgation of separate administrative rules for each type of care. Awareness of the

potential differences which might exist between these two sets of rules led to the decision to implement the Registration Project as soon as newly promulgated family day care rules became effective. It was believed that a conversion to a new set of administrative rules after the beginning of the Project would introduce an additional research variable in the middle of the Project Data Collection. The potential of confusion caused by this additional variable of the final data analysis was believed to be great enough to warrant holding the Project implementation until the completion of the promulgation process.

Simultaneous with the promulgation process, national experts on regulation were contacted to assist in the development of a conceptual framework for registration in Michigan. At this time, the purpose of the Project was clearly defined as "the study of registration to determine if registration would be a more appropriate type of regulatory system than licensing from the operational viewpoint of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy".

Based on this, three approaches to regulation were to be compared in matched sets of counties. The first approach was to be registration including the components of staff training, mass media information and provider training. The second and third approaches were to use licensing. The difference between these two licensing approaches consisted of one approach being licensing as currently practiced and the other being "enriched" licensing.

The "enrichment" aspects of licensing involved the addition of the identical registration components of staff training, mass media information. and provider information. By including these additional components for the "enriched" approach, a clearer assessment could be made as to the effect of public information and staff training. Without these additions, there was concern as to whether the regulatory process or the training and information components would be responsible for the findings.

B. Information and Training Components

The development and implementation of the information component of registration and enriched licensing involved the following aspects:

1. Establishing a family day care home resource library located at each county Department of Social Services office for use by providers and staff to seek information on child care.
2. Gathering information on safety, nutrition, inexpensive home day care publications and county community resources. This information was included in a provider resource packet. The packet is given to each new registrant or licensee to assist him in providing care and to serve as an incentive in seeking additional child care information.
3. Writing of a bi-monthly family day care home newsletter to be mailed to all regulated family day care homes in the experimental counties. The newsletter's purpose is to share ideas between providers and to communicate practical ideas for child care (See Appendix B).
4. Developing a public information package composed of radio public service announcements, a slide show and script on family day care regulation, and a pamphlet entitled "Day Care is More Than Just Babysitting." The media package addresses the legal requirement to be licensed or registered, the benefits available through regulation, and the importance of family day care homes as a community service (See Appendix C).
5. Writing of a series of newspaper articles on family day care homes which are released quarterly to the newspapers with circulation within the experimental counties to inform the general public and unlicensed/unregistered providers about family day care.

Department of Social Services staff had the assistance of several public and private agencies in the development of the information component. Assistance was obtained from the Michigan Department of Public Health, Michigan Dairy Council. Michigan Cooperative Extension, Upjohn Company, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, Cinema Associates of Lansing, St. Lawrence Hospital Poison Control Center, and the Michigan Community Coordinated Child Care Council.

The training component consisted of the operationalization of an ongoing training plan for family day care home providers and department regulatory staff. The provider training aspect, along with the information component, was developed with the awareness of its applicability for future statewide use. In exploring the training resources available, one organization, MSU Cooperative Extension Service, was identified as a statewide resource which was located in each county and which offered expertise in child development, home management. budgeting, nutrition, safety and money management. Contact was made with State Cooperative Extension personnel to discuss the possibility of involving the county extension offices located within the experimental counties. Cooperative Extension Service assisted the Project by conducting group meetings for family day care home providers on topics of interest.

A training plan for department workers was developed to include:

1. An introduction to the Project and the data collection tools.
2. An interpretation of the new family day care home administrative rules.
3. A licensing workshop with Norris Class, national regulatory expert, on the theoretical base of regulatory administration and the licensing process.
4. An interpretation of manual procedures for licensing or registration.
5. The use of the mass media package and how to make community contacts to disseminate the information throughout the county.
6. Consultation skills to upgrade child care services.
7. Confrontation skills dealing with noncompliance issues.

8. Skill in dealing with resistance to regulation.

9. A workshop on current issues in regulation and child care.

Discussions with county staff served as valuable input in deciding on content areas of the training plan with training sessions planned on a quarterly basis.

C. Overview of the Registration Process

Thecretical concepts outlined by Norris Class and Gwen Morgan were studied in relation to current day care licensing practices in Michigan. County Department of Social Services staff and Department of Health, Education and Welfare personnel worked with the state staff to design a registration process which was consistent with the conceptual framework of registration and the statutory base of Act 116, P.A. 1973, while at the same time being sensitive to its field practicability for the State of Michigan.

Operationally, registration is composed of two phases: the act of registering and registration supervision. It is built on the assumptions that most people wish to comply with the laws of the State and that most family day care homes are in compliance with the majority of the family day care rules. The first phase begins with an inquiry from an individual interested in family day care. At this time, the inquirer receives a packet containing the information and forms necessary for registration. Upon receiving the packet, the inquirer is to carefully read the materials to determine if his home meets the administrative rules. The person, also, must contact three individuals who are willing to serve as references and are willing to complete the reference release statements enclosed in the inquiry packet. These statements function as the community's endorsements of the care the person will give day care children.

The person takes the three reference statements to the county Department of Social Services office to register. At the county office, the person completes and signs a Statement of Registration, the legal document on which he certifies

that he has and will continue to comply with the Act and rules. The registrant's signature is witnessed by a department representative who is available to answer any questions and to give further interpretation of the rules. Prior to leaving the office, the registrant is given a packet of resource materials on child care.

The registration renewal process follows the same format as an original registration, except that a visit to the county office is not required. The Statement of Registration may be completed by mail if the registrant's signature is notarized.

The registration is in effect for two years from the date of the signature on the Statement of Registration, as long as the registrant continues to meet the rules and remains living at the same address. The Department of Social Services has regulatory responsibility for supervising the home during the registration period. Supervision is conducted on the basis of random spot checks. Also, the department follows up all complaints having the potential of rule violations with an on-site evaluation.

Monthly, a random sample of registered homes is drawn to determine which homes will be investigated for compliance during the coming month. Each registrant is given advance notice of the spot check visit and is informed of tne visit's purpose. A worker, when visiting the home, inspects the home for compliance with the Act and all administrative rules. References are also contacted for a futher statement on the registrant's suitability to meet the needs of children.

Complaints are one means by which the community notifies the Department of Social Services of the need for increased supervision of a particular home. Upon receiving a complaint, a Department worker makes a spot check visit to the home to assess compliance with the rule(s) alleged to be in violation.

A home will not be inspected during the two-year registration period if it is not selected for a spot check or if a complaint is not received on the home. Thus, registration supervision allows department staff to be available to supervise a greater number of homes, to give closer supervision to those homes needing additional help, and to offer consultation services to those homes requesting assistance for improving child care.

D. County Selection

Act 116, P.A. 1973, states "the Department may conduct in up to 3 counties a 2-year demonstration project of registration". Given this parameter which limits the registration process to a maximum of 3 counties. the department chose two sets of counties containing three matched counties in each set. Set I counties were to be counties having a 1973 population of over 100,000 people compared to Set II counties having a 1973 population of under 100,000. Each set would have 2 experimental counties and one control county listed as A, B, & C with:

Experimental County A - conducting registration.

Experimental County B - conducting enriched licensing.

Experimental County C - conducting licensing as currently practices.

One of the first tasks in the selection of counties was to identify the total population to which final findings were to apply. This population was defined geographically to the State of Michigan with the sampling units, authorized in Section 9 of Act 116, P.A. of 1973, to be counties having populations of less than 1.000.000 people. A map of Michigan showing the Department of Social Services' regional units and the counties contained in each region, was used as a source list.

Sampling was done by a quota method with the following conditions established:

1. The counties should have a large enough population so that the conclusions from the sampling can be considered valid and reliable enough to be representative of the state.

2. The counties should reflect as much of an urban-rural composition as possible.

3. Only the control counties could be adjacent geographically to each other. Experimental counties could not be adjacent, nor could experimental and control counties be adjacent.

After reviewing the 1973 population data on 83 counties in relation to the three aforementioned conditions and the Act's exclusion of counties having a population of more than 1,000,000, 13 counties were selected as potential matches. Approximately half of these 13 counties had similar population statistics over 100,000 and half had population statistics of under 100,000. All 13 counties were grouped according to population:

a) Under 100,000 people

Shiawassee
Midland
Marquette
Chippewa
Alpena
Allegan
Livingston

b) Over 100,000 people

Kent
Saginaw
Kalamazoo
Washtenaw
Genesee
Ingham

Geographic location and measures of employment, day care, estimated 1974 population and labor force participation were gathered on the 13 selected counties by the Day Care Licensing Division of the Office of Inter-Agency Services and the Social Services Evaluation and Program Analysis Division. Specific variables examined were:

1. Estimated 1974 total population.
2. Median family income.
3. Number ADC-regular cases.

4. Number of women with children under six.
5. Number and percent of women who work with children under six.
6. Unemployment rate.
7. Number of licensed family day care homes.
8. Number of licensed day care centers and nursery schools.
9. Capacity of licensed family day care homes.
10. Capacity of licensed day care centers and nursery schools.
11. Number of migrants using day care.

The above variables were matched as closely as possible for the 13 counties. The purpose of matching the counties was to allow for more accurate evaluation and comparison of the regulatory processes.

After all of the above had been considered, Livingston, Alpena. Allegan, and Chippewa had been eliminated from the grouping of small counties. Livingston did not reflect a balance in its urban-rural composition as the county is mainly rural.* Chippewa and Alpena were omitted because of their distance from Lansing. This factor was believed to be of significance due to limited project funds, the cost of travel to and from the county site for state and county staff, and the means of travel available to reach the county sites.

In the second grouping of counties, three of the six large counties were omitted. Two counties, Kent and Genesee, were eliminated due to their population size being 200,000 greater than any other counties in the grouping and a third county was not available to serve as a match. The third large county omitted was Saginaw with an ADC caseload four times greater than the remaining three large counties in the sample.*

Final determination of which of the remaining 3 counties in each set would be the 2 experimental--registration and enriched licensing--and which would be control--licensing--was based on operational factors of proximity to Lansing and

*The selection of Midland and Washtenaw Counties further eliminated Saginaw and Livingston Counties as Project sites due to their adjacent location to two of the experimental counties.

regional offices for supervision, data collection, use of limited resources, and the current emphasis in the counties for greater use of home day care than center day care. The counties tentatively selected for the following regulatory approaches were:

Set 1	County A - Registration: Kalamazoo County B - Enriched Licensing: Washtenaw County C - Licensing as currently practiced: Ingham
Set 2	County A - Registration: Midland County B - Enriched Licensing: Marquette County C - Licensing: Shiawassee

In early February, 1974, six Regional Directors were requested to consider the tentative inclusion of a county in his region and to indicate a willingness to have that county included as a part of the Project. All reactions were positive, thus finalizing the county selection.

Project county staff were contacted in early summer of 1974 to introduce the staff to the Project, its purpose, design, and data collection components (See Appendix A). Experimental county staff met separately from control county staff with the controls receiving a general overview of the Project as compared to lengthly discussions with the experimental counties on the proposed regulatory processes.

It was originally hoped that the controls would be able to remain anonymous. However, this was not operationally feasible as no available means existed to retrieve the needed data from each control county with the current Social Services' reporting systems. It was, therefore, necessary for all regulatory workers in Project counties to collect data.

Initial staff reactions to the Project were mixed; each county was pleased with the regulatory process it was assigned. Reasons for each county's acceptance of its assigned regulatory approach generated from four areas:

1. Control counties were content to collect only Project data as this meant they would not be bothered with other additional expectations.
2. "Enriched" counties displayed skepticism of registration, feeling its potential of harm to children was great. Therefore, the staffs were pleased to be able to continue with licensing.
3. The four licensing counties, also, questioned whether a family day care provider would truthfully certify that he had complied with the rules. Each county felt a department representative's visit to the home was necessary prior to issuing a license or a Certificate of Registration to assure the rules were met.
4. Although the registration counties experienced some skepticism of registration, they were interested in demonstrating a new regulatory approach. Realizing the limitations of licensing family day care with the current staffing levels, these counties were interested in learning if registration offered advantages.

Throughout the development of the registration and enriched licensing processes, the experimental counties were involved in providing input on field procedures, characteristics, and problems. The more involved each county became in the process development, the more supportive they were of the final output.

E. Planning Difficulties

As the development of the planning stages progressed, a number of difficulties arose which needed to be resolved. These difficulties and their solutions are enumerated below:

1. The establishment of a direct, fast communication line from State Office to the county worker and supervisor. Permission was obtained from the Regional and County Directors to bypass the official communication line from State to County offices.

2. The development of operational field procedures for registration of family day care homes from a conceptual framework which was basically untried anywhere in the United States. Excellent input was obtained from the Project counties on specific field characteristics and from national consultants who viewed the design from a broad conceptual perspective and previous regulatory experience.

3. The comparison of data drawn on homes licensed under the foster care rules to homes licensed or registered under new family day care home's administrative rules. Comparison was drawn between selected "like" rules contained in both sets of administrative rules.

4. The development of a population of registered providers early in the Project from which data could be drawn for at least four data quarters of the year. Licensing providers in the registration counties were encouraged to convert to registration and the new rules as part of the Project. This proved to be successful, as data was drawn on registered homes by the third month of the Project.

5. The handling of staff turnover at the county and regional level; the improvement of the clerical support available to workers, and the decrease in the number of regulatory cases assigned to each worker. Staff turnover was and continues to be great, causing a continual need to retrain workers. Clerical support has improved in most counties so worker time does need not be spent on typing, filing, or sending out mailings. Gains made in regulatory caseloads were temporary. New workers were hired and would then leave and the position was frozen. Currently, two counties are operating with one worker to 550 registered homes and one worker to 350 licensed homes.

6. The development of a media package which was non-threatening while at the same time informed people of the law and encouraged providers to become licensed or registered. A media package was developed which communicated an explanation of family day care, the advantages of being regulated including the protections offered to parents, providers, and children, and the Act requirement that all persons providing this type of care need to be registered or licensed. No mention was made of the Act's penalties for not being licensed or registered.

7. The determination of total number of children actually receiving care in family day care rather than the total licensed capacity of the homes. While the workers conduct quarterly random spot checks for compliance to the rules, they also determined the number of children actually in care. These spot checks will serve as the basis of an estimate on the total number of children in care for the Project counties.

Chapter 4. METHODS

Through the Project design, licensing and registration are being compared from the operational viewpoints of effectiveness, efficiency and economy to test the following hypotheses:

H.1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving care in regulated family day care homes than the licensing counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of regulated homes having rule violations than the licensing counties.

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or a lower expenditure of funds per home regulated than the licensing counties.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

Pre data was collected for the first year of the Project on the basis of one month per quarter year. This data established a base line of county activity for family day care homes in the areas of inquiries, adverse actions, number of homes regulated, staffing patterns, cost per home regulated, and complaints. Seasonal trends within each county were identified and the differences between counties such as the employment situation, composition of the DSS staff, and the community resources available were noted. During this time the data instruments were tested as to clarity, ability to collect needed data, and ease of use.

Project data comparing the two regulatory processes began August, 1975, and is planned to continue for one and a half years. The scheduled Project data months are October, 1975, January, 1976, April, 1976, August, 1976, October, 1976, and January, 1977, thus allowing time for the impact of input components (new licensing rules, new regulatory procedures, spot checks to determine continued compliance, and public service media package) to be measured.

Data collection during a data month begins the first working day of the month and continues through the last working day of the month. Collection occurrs at State and county levels depending on where the most accurate source of information

is located. In order to prove the four Project hypotheses, a number of areas are being examined. A further explanation of each of these areas follows below:

1. Number of Homes Regulated. Data is being drawn on the number of licensed/registered day care providers from Department of Social Services computer provider listings run during the given data month.
2. Number of Child Slots Available. The Department of Social Services provider listing also includes the total number of children for which each home is licensed, thus enabling monthly totals of capacity to be determined for the Project.
3. Provider Attitudes. A questionnaire to measure provider attitudes as they relate to state regulation will be mailed to all registered and licensed providers in the Project in the early spring of 1976. The mailing list will be taken from the Department of Social Services computer provider listing. It is hoped an incentive can be included in the mailing to encourage providers to complete and return the questionnaire.
4. Inquiries about Family Day Care. Tallies are completed by county staff for each inquiry (mail, phone, and walk-in) received. Through inquiries, an assessment will be done as to the effect of the media package in causing non-regulated providers to inquire about licensing or registration.
5. Number of Complaints Received. Complaints of three types are being tallied:
   a) any complaints on non-regulated day care homes
   b) complaints which are not rule related on regulated homes
   c) complaints which are rule related on regulated homes

   Specific rules allegedly in violation are being charted to determine the potential life/safety factors involved for children in care.

6. Non-conformity to Administrative Rules. Instances of rule violations are being gathered during the data months through discoveries of non-compliance at the time initial and on-going supervision visits and random spot checks are conducted. In licensing counties, initial and on-going supervision is keyed to the receipt of an application for licensure and the effective date of the license. Registration supervision is done on the basis of a monthly 8% random sample of all homes registered in the county. In addition to the supervisory visits, all counties conduct a spot check visit of 3% of their homes which focuses on 15 key rules and sub-rules. This percentage is selected through a random sampling done in state office on the 15th day of the month prior to the data month. This allows county staff ample time to contact selected providers and arrange a visit date during the data month. Random samples are drawn from the Department's computer provider listing.

7. Estimated Number of Child in Care. Part of the 3% random spot check procedure is the determination of the number of children actually in care. By gaining this information along with regulated capacity, an estimate will be made as to the total number of children in care in each county.

8. Costs per Regulated Home. Compilation of cost data is undertaken each data month and includes Department of Social Services regulatory staffing costs; training costs for providers and Department of Social Services' staff; transportation costs related to training, regulatory visits and public information; and media costs for public education.

Following the collection of the data, a comparison of means between the experimental and control groups is being used as the statistical treatment.*

*(Examples of data forms may be found in Appendix D.)

Chapter 5. FINDINGS

Four primary hypotheses are to be tested in the demonstration project. The pre-project and project data which tests these hypotheses are presented in this Part with a brief discussion and analysis. The analysis of the data for the Project includes one year of pre-data and two months (August 1975 and October 1975) of project data. Thus, the conclusions discussed below can only be considered tentative at this time.

H_1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving family day care home care than the licensing counties.

Table 1 presents the number of homes regulated under the different regulatory approaches (i.e., registration, enriched licensing, regular licensing). Two of the three highest increases in homes being regulated were found in the registration counties. This suggests that the registration process probably increases the number of children being cared for in regulated family day care homes in comparison to the licensing process.

This same finding is reflected in Table 2 which described the changes in the number of child slots (i.e., number of children for which a home is licensed or registered) in the regulated homes.

Moreover, in Table 3, the registration counties reported the highest increases in the number of children being cared for in family day care homes whose day care costs were being paid by the Department of Social Services.

According to the spot-check procedure introduced in experimental counties, only 63% of the total licensed/registered capacity is ever utilized in any given month. Of those children for whom care is given, only about 25% are children whose care is paid for by Department of Social Services.

TABLE 1

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1976

DATA	Months of Data COLLECTION	BIG COUNTIES			SMALL COUNTIES		
		Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
		KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASSEE
1. NUMBER OF HOMES REGULATED	PRE-DATA						
	1974 Aug.	352	307	658	95	78	88
	Oct.	366	307	655	95	84	83
	1975 Jan.	394	328	638	93	89	85
	April	404	349	658	94	90	82
	Average	379	323	652	94	85	85
	PROJECT DATA						
	1975 Aug.	512	360	686	112	108	83
	Oct.	577	351	679	117	107	81
	1976 Jan.						
	April						
	Average	545	356	683	115	108	82
	Diff. between pre & project	+166	+ 33	+ 31	+ 21	+ 23	- 3
	%	+ 44%	+ 10%	+ 5%	+ 22%	+ 27%	-4%

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1976

DATA	Months of Data COLLECTION	BIG COUNTIES			SMALL COUNTIES		
		Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
		KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASSEE
2. NUMBER OF CHILD SLOTS	PRE-DATA						
	1974 Aug.	1,094	1,010	2,021	319	193	269
	Oct.	1,171	1,031	2,050	316	199	269
	1975 Jan.	1,286	1,180	2,004	304	213	297
	April	1,374	1,289	2,078	317	224	295
	Average	1,231	1,128	2,038	314	207	283
	PROJECT DATA						
	1975 Aug.	1,739	1,305	2,122	372	250	296
	Oct.	1,981	1,300	2,132	386	258	289
	1976 Jan.						
	April						
	Average	1,860	1,303	2,127	379	254	293
	Diff. between pre & project	+ 616	+ 175	+ 89	+ 65	+ 47	+ 10
	% Change	+ 50%	+ 16%	+ 4%	+ 21%	+ 23%	+ 4%

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1976

DATA	Months of Data COLLECTION	BIG COUNTIES			SMALL COUNTIES		
		Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
		KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASSEE
. 3. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DSS CHILDREN CARED FOR	PRE-DATA						
	1974 Aug.	211	181	320	44	43	70
	Oct.	239	160	328	62	46	69
	1975 Jan.	285	208	372	75	53	55
	April	293	213	322	81	35	47
	Average	257	191	336	66	44	60
	PROJECT DATA						
	1975 Aug.	286	172	256	81	42	42
	Oct.	319	197	263	66	40	25
	1976 Jan.						
	April						
	Average	303	185	260	74	41	34
	Diff. between pre & project	+ 46	- 6	- 76	+ 8	- 3	- 26
	% Change	+ 18%	- 3%	- 23%	+12%	- 7%	- 43%

41

Although a direct count of the number of children actually being cared for in these counties is not available, it in inferred that an increase in the number of homes regulated results in a corresponding increase in the number of children for whom care is given. If this line of reasoning is accepted, then it seems that hypothesis 1 is supported by the data: namely, registration counties have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving family day care home care than licensing counties. This seems to be truer of the large counties than the small counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of rule violations than the licensing counties.

Table 4 presents the number of homes having violations of rules discovered when the homes were spotchecked. In general, there are very few homes that have been spotchecked in October (N=199). Of these, 44 (22%) were in violation of one or more rules. There has been an increase in the number of rule violations across all Project counties with the largest increase in a regular licensing county (Ingham). A more indicative finding, however, is the percent of homes checked that were in violation of one or more rules. The two highest percentages for the one data month available were both registration counties, with Midland reporting 100% of the homes checked in violation with one or more rules. Kalamazoo reported 60% of the homes checked in violation as compared to 11%-58% of the licensed homes checked being in violation. This finding raises question about the level of protection to children provided by registration as it relates to rule compliance. Future analysis will investigate the kinds of rules being violated and will assess the seriousness (i.e., risk factor involved) of these violations in terms of the safety and care of the children.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1976

DATA	Months of Data COLLECTION	BIG COUNTIES			SMALL COUNTIES		
		Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
		KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASSEE
5. NUMBER OF HOMES HAVING VIOLATION OF RULES	**PRE-DATA**						
Note: This percent refers to the number of homes in violation of some rule relative to the number of homes that were spot-checked in that month.	1974 Aug.	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Oct.	2	4	4	0	1	0
	1975 Jan.	0	0	1	0	1	1
	April	0	3	0	0	0	0
	Average	1	2	1	0	1	1
	PROJECT DATA						
	1975 Aug.	0	1	4	0	0	1
	Oct.	6 (60%)*	8 (18%)*	16 (16%)*	4 (100%)*	7 (58%)*	3 (11%)*
	1976 Jan.						
	April						
	Average	3	5	10	2	4	2
	Diff. between pre & project	+2	+3	+ 9	+2	+3	+1
	% Change	+200%	+50 %	+900%	+200%	+300%	0%

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or lower expenditures of funds per child protected than the licensing counties.

The costs involved in the different regulatory approaches have been collected in the areas of personnel, transportation, training information programs and miscellaneous costs (i.e., library material). These costs are presented in Tables 5a and 5b. Not all of these costs are comparable across all three regulatory methods. For example, the regular licensing counties do not need to be trained in a new process. Some of the costs are also one-time expenditures (i.e., mass media package). Nonetheless, the costs for each regulatory approach have been estimated.

In general, across all three approaches, the costs have increased from the pre-project months to the project months. The largest increases as well as the largest single cost item is in the area of personnel.

There is also a lower cost incurred in the larger counties regardless of the regulatory method used. In short, there seems to be an economy of scale taking place in the larger counties.

When controlling for county size, the least expensive homes to regulate are the present regular licensing homes and the most expensive to regulate are the enriched licensing homes. This is probably due, in part, to the expense of the mass media package and increased training for workers which was shared by the enriched licensing counties and the registration counties.

The homes regulated through the registration process reported costs somewhere between the highest and lowest expenditures (keeping the county size constant). These costs may decrease as the expense of the mass media package is distributed over the remaining months of the project and if the increase in the number of homes regulated continues.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

TABLE 5a

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1976

	BIG COUNTIES			SMALL COUNTIES		
	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
	KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASSEE
8. COSTS (AVERAGE) Pre-Project Data						
A. Personnel	$1,118.00	$2,143.00	$2,853.00	$593.00	$580.00	$805.00
B. Transportation	67.75	72.55	151.73	16.05	32.54	20.01
C. Training	515.50	410.03	51.70	392.99	298.33	39.72
D. Information Programs	3.52	30.36	0	0	4.12	0
E. Other	2.60	2.60	0	2.35	2.35	0
F. Total	1,707.37	2,658.54	3,056.43	1,004.39	917.34	864.73
G. Homes	379	323	652	94	85	85
H. Cost Per Home Regulated	$4.50	$8.23	$4.69	$10.69	$10.79	$10.17

TABLE 5b

RESULTS OF PRE AND PROJECT DATA FOR REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

1974-1975

	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing	Registration	Enriched Licensing	Regular Licensing
	KALAMAZOO	WASHTENAW	INGHAM	MIDLAND	MARQUETTE	SHIAWASEE
8. COSTS (AVERAGE) Project Data						
A. Personnel	$2,242.00	$2,143.00	$3,087.00	$ 417.00	$ 474.00	$ 758.00
B. Transportation	16.77	79.35	140.93	10.73	19.60	44.65
C. Training	588.57	397.55	278.05	472.29	696.61	195.45
D. Information Programs	1,014.17	1,021.23	00	934.17	942.02	00
E. Other (Library Materials)	1.50	1.50	00	.75	.75	00
F. Total	$3,863.01	$3,642.63	$4,506.68	$1,834.94	$2,332.98	$ 998.10
G. Homes	545	356	683	115	108	82
H. Cost Per Home Regulated	$ 7.09	$ 10.23	$ 5.13	$ 15.96	$ 21.60	$ 12.17

Table 1 has already illustrated the fact that there is a higher percentage increase of homes being regulated in registration counties (when controlling for county size) than in the other counties. This suggests that more providers are willing to become regulated under this approach than through enriched licensing or regular licensing.

Further information on provider attitudes will be collected near the end of the Project. At this time, the providers in each of the counties will be asked to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire will gather data on their reactions to the process under which they have been regulated.

Chapter 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preliminary findings of the demonstration project suggest that the registration approach results in a higher number of homes regulated, an increased number of homes having one or more rule violations, moderate costs incurred and a greater willingness for providers to become regulated. It is recommended that the demonstration project be continued to gather further comparative data between licensing and registration (currently only two months have been collected and analyzed) and to explore the long-range consequences of the registration process.

If the Project were to end at this point, the basic recommendation is to weigh the advantages of increasing the number of homes regulated under registration while at the same time increasing the percentage of registered homes having rule violations versus having fewer homes licensed with a lower percentage of homes in violation. Means of reducing the rule violations in the registration counties and the risk factor to the child's safety would have to be considered. Violations in the registration counties primarily center on the registrant's failure to obtain a tuberculosis test and physician's statement and to maintain required records on each child in care. All of the aforementioned violations are easily correctable if the registrant desires to do so.

If the decision is made to implement registration on a statewide basis so as to increase the number of regulated providers, the following options to decrease the percentage of homes having rule violations needs to be explored:

1. The requirement of proof of freedom from communicable tuberculosis to be presented at the time of registering along with the currently required reference statements.

2. An increased emphasis on rule interpretations and the rules' importance at the time of registering.

3. An increase in supervision above the 8% sample of registered homes which is now being checked monthly.

It is, however, the formal recommendation of this report that the Project be continued for one year so that additional Project data can be collected and analyzed. This recommendation means the final Project completion date will be June 30, 1977. The final report to the Legislature, however, will be submitted no later than March 1, 1977.

Project Staff

State Office

Jeralyn Harrold Lowe, Project Manager, Family Home Licensing Unit
Jacqueline Wood, Project Assistant, Family Home Licensing Unit
Reginald K. Carter, Ph.D. Research, Social Services Evaluation and Program Analysis

Kalamazoo County (Registration)

Bruce Cleveland, Supervisor
Marge Hannapel
Linda Whitfield (3-75 to 1-76)
Sue Carpenter

Washtenaw County (Enriched Licensing)

Carla Lambarth, Supervisor
Wilma Krause
Shirley Moredyk (7-74 to 1-76)

Midland County (Registration)

Mary Huntley, Supervisor
Carla Randle
Kathy Gravis

Marquette County (Enriched Licensing)

Angela Gingrass, Supervisor
Tom Dunleavy

Ingham County (Licensing)

Roselyn Chaffin, Supervisor
Janet Forslin
Andi Brendle
Jil Gahsman

Shiawassee County (Licensing)

Mary Whitfield, Supervisor
Dianne Morales

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURE FOR BECOMING REGISTERED
AS A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME
IN KALAMAZOO COUNTY

1) Call us between 8am and 5pm weekdays at 382-2870 and ask for Day Care Registration. Ask the registration worker to send you the information packet on Family Day Care Registration.

2) When you receive the packet, read it over carefully. Then obtain three signatures from personal references on the forms provided.

3) Bring these three signed reference forms into the Day Care Registration Office. Please call ahead to make sure the registration worker will be there.

4) At the office you will be asked to complete a Statement of Registration verifying that you intend to comply with State Act 116 and the Family Day Care Rules throughout the period of your registration.

5) After registering, you'll receive a packet of child care information, and you may also check out books and pamphlets from our day care library. At this time we are also available for consultation.

6) Before you leave the office, the worker will explain that you need to return a medical statement signed by a doctor, as well as TB tests for everyone over 14 years of age living in your home.

7) Within several weeks you will receive a Certificate of Registration.

Any questions? Please call us:

KALAMAZOO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES
Family Day Care Registration

382-2870

SELECTING A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME

The choice you make in terms of child care is tremendously important. The family day care home you choose plays a critical role in your child's development. Your choice can determine how smoothly your days will start. It becomes an important factor in how comfortable you are in leaving your child each day. It is the key to how your child will enjoy his day.

Take time in selecting your child's family day care home! It is an important decision. Visit several homes before you decide. A home which is great for one child may not be right for your child. Here are some ways to get started in your selection.

1. SELECT A HOME FROM THE LICENSED/REGISTERED FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES IN YOUR AREA. CALL THE DAY CARE UNIT AT YOUR COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE NAMES OF HOMES IN YOUR AREA.

2. LOOK INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF EACH HOME WHERE YOUR CHILD WOULD BE PLAYING. TRY TO VISIT THE HOME WHEN OTHER CHILDREN ARE THERE SO YOU CAN SEE HOW THE CAREGIVER AND CHILDREN RELATE TO EACH OTHER.

3. TALK WITH AND OBSERVE THE CAREGIVER. ASK YOURSELF, DOES THE CAREGIVER:

a. seem to enjoy being with children?
b. appear open to questions & ideas?
c. show children warmth by smiling, laughing, cuddling, holding, & touching?
d. spend time playing, talking, reading, & pretending with the children?
e. handle discipline in a kind, fair, & consistent manner?
f. save visits with friends or watching TV until naptime or after the children are gone?
g. respect each child & his feelings?
h. watch children carefully in & out of doors?

4. DISCUSS WHAT YOUR CHILD WILL DO DURING THE DAY. WILL HE:

a. have a variety of toys & games to play with? Have activities to do like helping make snacks, looking at books, drawing, singing, climbing, etc.
b. have a quiet place he can be by himself?
c. go on walks to see interesting things in the neighborhood?
d. watch TV sparingly for only 1-2 special programs instead of all morning each day?

5. IF CHILDREN ARE PRESENT WHILE YOU ARE IN THE HOME, DO THEY:

a. look & act happy?
b. seem to like & trust the caregiver?
c. seem to enjoy what they are doing?
d. fight or cry alot? If so, why?

6. FINALLY ASK YOURSELF:

a. do you feel comfortable with the caregiver & the home?
b. can you visit the home during the day if you want?
c. would the caregiver take time to talk with you about the "important little things" your child does?
d. is the caregiver caring for only the number of children for which she is licensed/registered?

Remember Day Care is More Than Just Babysitting! Any other questions?

Please Call Us:

Family Day Care Registration/Licensing

APPENDIX D

Cost Information

Fill out the following information as best you can to help us determine the cost of registration and licensing in your county during the data months.

1. Transportation Costs: (Attach Travel Expense Report)

   a) Number of miles traveled during data month?

   _____ What % of these miles were for family day care home regulation? _____

   b) What is the reimbursement rate for the above mileage? _____

   c) How many licensing visits were covered under this mileage? _____

2. Public, Provider, and Consumer Infoemation Costs

   a) Briefly describe what occurred in your county during the data month relating to public information for family day care homes? Give the estimated time and cost involved per month.

   b) Briefly describe any family day care provider information that occurred during the month. Estimate cost and time.

   c) What occurred in your county for consumer information? Estimate cost and time for the month.

   d) (1) Did any of the above involve your time during evenings and weekends for which you worked overtime? Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, how much _____

   (2) List how many meetings or visits you were involved outside of "8 a.m.– 5 p.m.." this month.

   (3) Did you work any other evenings or weekends on Family Day Care Regulation?

County Name: _____

Month of: _____

Staffing Patterns for Family Day Care Home Regulation

Please review and answer the following as accurately as possible based on what is actually in existence on the 1st working day of a data month.

1. How many workers license/register family day care homes in your county?

2. What is the average caseload size for each family day care home regulatory worker?

   Full-time licensing/registration worker: _____

   Part-time licensing/registrationwworker: a) _____ (family day care homes)

   b) _____ (other caseloads)

3. At what civil service level are the above regulatory workers. What % of time does each worker, at a specific level, contribute to family day care home regulation?

	Civil Service Level	% of time
Worker 1	_____	_____
Worker 2	_____	_____
Worker 3	_____	_____
Worker 4	_____	_____
Worker 5	_____	_____

4. How many support staff persons (clerks and/or aides) do you allocate to family day care home regulation. (this does not include other day care services).

   Clerks _____

   Aides _____

5. At what civil service level are your clerks and/or aides who work with family day care home licensing/registration? What % of time does each clerk, at a specific level, contribute to regulation.

	Civil Service Level	% of time
Clerk 1	_____	_____
Clerk 2	_____	_____
Clerk 3	_____	_____
Clerk 4	_____	_____
Clerk 5	_____	_____
Clerk 6	_____	_____
Aide 1	_____	_____
Aide 2	_____	_____
Aide 3	_____	_____

County Name: _____

Month of _____

Thanks a lot!

NON-CONFORMITY TO RULES

1. Keep a tally of noncompliance, adverse action, withdrawal of applications, and returns of license/certificates you handle during the month. Use a slash [/] to tally totals and sub-headings.

2. After each sub-heading tally (e.g. Spot Check), list the rule violations by number which relate to a particular home. Be certain to use the full number of each rule to indicate whether the home was investigated under new or old rules.
Example: \-1302(b), 1305, 1312(2) or \-10, 15, 22.

NOTE: Some sub-headings relate to licensing only.
Example: The registration process does not include denial.

3. If you tally a home twice under the same sub-heading during the month, draw a circle around the second tally.

MONTH OF _____ COUNTY OF _____

I. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOMES FOUND IN NONCOMPLIANCE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Periodic Visit (rule violations by #)	Spot Check (Project) (rule violations by #)	Spot Check (Supervision) (rule violations by #)	Central File Check and Complaint Investigation (rule violations by #)
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.
	4.	4.	4.

II. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADVERSE OR PROVISIONAL ACTIONS RECOMMENDED: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Denials	Revocation	Refusals to Renew	Provisionals (Noncompl)
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.

II. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOMES YOU WOULD HAVE DENIED OR CLOSED IF THE LICENSE/APPLICATION HAD NOT BEEN WITHDRAWN OR RETURNED VOLUNTARILY: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Voluntarily Withdrawal of Application	Voluntarily Return of Certificate/License
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

County _____

Media Pamphlet Distribution

Record the following information so that we will be able to assess the impact of the media package. List all places and amounts where you have distributed the pamphlets.

Month	Place-Where Pamphlets Were Displayed	Number Distributed

Sent to Jackie - at end of each data month.

NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS

DIRECTIONS: 1. Keep a tally of all complaints you receive during the month. Use a slash [/] to cross off the numeral below listed under the appropriate heading: A - RULE-RELATED COMPLAINTS
B - NON-RULE RELATED COMPLAINTS
C - HOMES OPERATING ILLEGALLY
(One slash (/) per complaint.)

2. After each tally under the headings A. - Rule-Related and C. - Homes Operating Illegally, list the alleged rule violations using the full rule number. (Example 7-1302(b), 1305 or 4-10, 15, 22) Complaints under heading A may relate to the old or the new rules depending on the set of rules under which the home is licensed. Heading C complaints will always pertain to new rules.

3. Some complaints tallied under headings A & C will require additional action after your initial contact with the provider. Any complaints requiring additional action are to be tallied with a slash under heading D.

MONTH OF: _____ COUNTY OF: _____

A. RULE-RELATED COMPLAINTS (alleged rule violations by # marked after numeral)		B. NON-RULE RELATED COMPLAINTS	C. HOMES OPERATING ILLEGALLY
1. _____	6. _____	1	1 _____
_____	_____	2	2 _____
_____	_____	3	3 _____
2. _____	7. _____	4	4 _____
_____	_____	5	5 _____
_____	_____	6	6 _____
3. _____	8. _____	7	7 _____
_____	_____	8	8 _____
_____	_____	9	9 _____
4. _____	9. _____	10	10 _____
_____	_____	11	11 _____
_____	_____	12	12 _____
5. _____	10. _____	13	13 _____
_____	_____	14	14 _____
_____	_____		

D. Mark the total # of Complaints Requiring Additional Action after an Initial Contact (e.g. follow-up letter, second home visit, etc.):

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

DIRECTIONS: Keep this sheet handy from the first to the last working day of each date month - August, October, January, and April. Whenever you receive an inquiry about family day care homes, cross out one of the numerals listed below. Tally each inquiry only once, unless the inquiry concerns 2 areas. The tally is to show us the total number of inquiries you received over one month. *NOTE: If you refer an inquiry on, don't tally it on your sheet. The person who finally gives the caller the needed information and deals with any further action should tally the call.

Example: Licensure Inquiry

1. A call from a person asking how he could become licensed. CODED: LICENSURE/PROVIDER.
2. An inquiry from a parent/consumer who wants to know what the state requires of a licensed home. CODED: LICENSURE INQUIRY/CONSUMER.

Placement Inquiry

3. A call from a provider stating she has openings for children in her home. CODED: PLACEMENT INQUIRY/PROVIDER.
4. A call from a parent asking for the names of licensed homes in her area. CODED: PLACEMENT INQUIRY/CONSUMER.

*ASK EACH INQUIRER IF HE LEARNED ABOUT FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES FROM HEARING A RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT OR SEEING A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, If the inquirer states "Yes", place a ✓ next to the numeral which you just tallied. (Example: 3 ✓)

MONTH OF _____ COUNTY OF _____

LICENSURE INQUIRY						PLACEMENT INQUIRY					
(1) Provider			(2) Consumer			(3) Provider			(4) Consumer		
1	31	61	1	31	61	1	31	61	1	31	61
2	32	62	2	32	62	2	32	62	2	32	62
3	33	63	3	33	63	3	33	63	3	33	63
4	34	64	4	34	64	4	34	64	4	34	64
5	35	65	5	35	65	5	35	65	5	35	65
6	36	66	6	36	66	6	36	66	6	36	66
7	37	67	7	37	67	7	37	67	7	37	67
8	38	68	8	38	68	8	38	68	8	38	68
9	39	69	9	39	69	9	39	69	9	39	69
10	40	70	10	40	70	10	40	70	10	40	70
11	41	71	11	41	71	11	41	71	11	41	71
12	42	72	12	42	72	12	42	72	12	42	72
13	43	73	13	43	73	13	43	73	13	43	73
14	44	74	14	44	74	14	44	74	14	44	74
15	45	75	15	45	75	15	45	75	15	45	75
16	46	76	16	46	76	16	46	76	16	46	76
17	47	77	17	47	77	17	47	77	17	47	77
18	48	78	18	48	78	18	48	78	18	48	78
19	49	79	19	49	79	19	49	79	19	49	79
20	50	80	20	50	80	20	50	80	20	50	80
21	51	81	21	51	81	21	51	81	21	51	81
22	52	82	22	52	82	22	52	82	22	52	82
23	53	83	23	53	83	23	53	83	23	53	83
24	54	84	24	54	84	24	54	84	24	54	84
25	55	85	25	55	85	25	55	85	25	55	85
26	56	86	26	56	86	26	56	86	26	56	86
27	57	87	27	57	87	27	57	87	27	57	87
28	58	88	28	58	88	28	58	88	28	58	88
29	59	89	29	59	89	29	59	89	29	59	89
30	60	90	30	60	90	30	60	90	30	60	90

Project Compliance Record

Spot Check for Old Rules

Instructions: Answer each question with a (√) in the "yes" or "no" box. If "no" is checked, the home must be marked in noncompliance with the rule or subrule. All rules not in compliance must be discussed with the licensee and the "Discuss" column is to be checked. Space for comments is provided at the bottom of each page.

1. LICENSEE'S FULL NAME		2. PROVIDER NO.	3. PHONE NO.
4. ADDRESS (Street Address, City, State, Zip Code)		5. COUNTY	6. NO. AND AGES LICENSED FOR
7. WORKER'S NAME	8. DATE AND TIME OF VISIT	9. RULES IN NON-COMPLIANCE	

10. OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD (Include the following information)

NAME	BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	HOURS HOME DURING DAY

Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 22. When infants and young children are in care. (a) Is each caregiver at least 18 years of age? ___Yes ___No (b) Is there someone at least 18 years of age, who is willing to help if an emergency occurred and the caregiver had to leave? _____Yes _____No Person's Name _____ Age: _____			
Rule 17. Is the caregiver able to move and think appropriately, quickly, and soundly to handle emergencies? _____Yes _____No Does the caregiver know where to get emergency help? _____Yes _____No			
Rule 2. Is the home caring for no more than 2 children under the age of 12 months at any one time including related children? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 19. Is the total number of children under 17 years of age in the home 3 or less, including related children? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
Rule 27.			
Does the daily routine promote good health, rest, and play habits by including:			
(a) Active play such as rolling, crawling, stretching, throwing, running, climbing, dancing, and being noisy? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Quiet play such as listening, reading, singing, drawing, painting, pretending, thinking, and playing alone with a toy? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Indoor and outdoor play as weather permits? ___Yes ___No			
(d) Sleep and/or rest? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Meals and/or snacks? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 31.			
Are varied, adequate, and wholesome meals/snacks served including sufficient quantities of:			
(a) Milk and milk products? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Meat and eggs? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Fruits and vegetables? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Whole grain cereals and breads? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 6.			
Is the home constructed, arranged, and maintained to adequately provide for the health and safety of occupants? ____Yes ____No			
Consider the following, in determining the above:			
(a) Rooms used by children well lighted and ventilated? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Porch, balcony, and stairway safe to protect children against falls (having handrails, steps in good repair, children's gates, or other sturdy barriers)? ___Yes ___No			
(c) Rooms used by children free from drafts and leaks? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Floors and wall kept clean? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No			
(f) Exits clear, easy to reach, and get out of? (Exits shall include doors, doorways, connecting hallways, stairways, operable windows, fire escapes, etc.) ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 9. (a) Do all rooms, used by children, have ceilings at least 5 feet above grade (ground) level? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Are all sleeping room windows easy to open (without tools), big enough and low enough for people to get out of quickly? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 14. Is the play space free from hazards by the following being out of reach of children: (a) Litter and rubbish? ____Yes ____No (b) Cleaning solutions, insecticides, and poisons? ____Yes ____No (c) Sharp objects (knives, etc.)? ____Yes ____No (d) Flammable materials (matches, gasoline)? ___Yes ___No (e) Bleaches and detergents? ____Yes ____No (f) Medical supplies? ____Yes ____No (g) Plastic bags? ____Yes ____No (h) Firearms? ____Yes ____No (i) Other similar materials such as mothballs, glues, etc.? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 15. Are medical statements in the licensing record for all members of the home over 12 years of age? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 34. Does the licensee keep a record of each child's name, age, and the date of his entry and discharge? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
Rule 35.			
Is the following information recorded for each day care child:			
(a) Names of parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Address and telephone number of the parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Places and hours of employment of parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Instructions for reaching the parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Name, address and telephone number of another person who might be reached in case of emergency? ____Yes ____No			
(f) Name, address and telephone number of the family physician? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Spot Check Summary (Use back if necessary) Note: Summary may include recommendation for further follow-up action.

DATE: WORKER'S SIGNATURE

Project Compliance Record

Spot Check for New Rules

Instructions: Answer each question with a (✓) in the "yes" or "no" box. If "no" is checked, the home must be marked in noncompliance with the rule or subrule. All rules not in compliance must be discussed with the licensee and the "Discuss" column is to be checked. Space for comments is provided at the bottom of each page.

1. LICENSEE'S FULL NAME		2. PROVIDER NO.	3. PHONE NO.
4. ADDRESS (Street Address, City, State, Zip Code)		5. COUNTY	6. NO. AND AGES LICENSED FOR
7. WORKER'S NAME	8. DATE AND TIME OF VISIT	9. RULES IN NON-COMPLIANCE	

10. OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD (Include the following information)

NAME	BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	HOURS HOME DURING DAY

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
Rule 1302.			
(1) (a) Is each caregiver at least 18 years of age? Age: _____ ____Yes ____No			
(d) Is the caregiver able to move and think appropriately, quickly, and soundly to handle emergencies? ____Yes ____No			
(3) Is there someone at least 18 years of age, who is willing to help in an emergency? ____Yes ____No			
Person's Name _____ Age: ____			
Does this person live close enough to respond quickly to an emergency? ____Yes ____No			
Is this person generally available during the times children are in care? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks Only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
Rule 1303.			
Is the ratio of caregivers to children present in the home at any one time a 1:6 ratio? (Count all un-related children in care and any related children under the age of 7 years.) ____Yes ____No			
(a) How many children are: Present_____ Related and under 7 years old_____ Unrelated and in care_____ Under 12 months old_____			
(b) How many caregivers are present giving direct care? _____			
Is each caregiver caring for no more than 2 children under the age of 12 months at any one time? _____Yes _____No			
Rule 1304.			
(2) Is there a daily schedule set up considering each child and including:			
(a) Active play such as rolling, crawling, stretching, throwing, running, climbing, dancing, and being noisy? _____Yes _____No			
Quiet play, such as listening, reading, singing, drawing, painting, pretending, thinking, and playing alone with a toy? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Indoor and outdoor play as weather permits? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Sleep and/or rest? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Meals and/or snacks? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1306.			
(1) Name the indoor and outdoor play equipment children can use. Indoor: _____ _____ _____ Outdoor: _____ _____ _____			
Is there enough play equipment that:			
(a) Is suitable for the ages and interests of the children? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
(b) Offers a variety of things to climb on, look at, handle, listen to, take apart, explore, pretend with, etc.? ____Yes ____No			
(2) Is the equipment safe, clean, and sturdy? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1307.			
(1) Does the licensee have a written food agreement worked out with <u>each</u> child's parent which includes when the child is to be fed, amounts of food to be served, and who provides the food? ____Yes ____No			
Are the meals/snacks nutritious, and well balanced in that they:			
(a) Include foods from each of the four basic food groups such as.... -- milk, cheeses, ice cream -- meat, eggs, dried beans, nuts -- dark green and yellow vegetables, fruits -- bread, cereal, rice, tortillas, grits? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Avoid high calorie, low nutrition foods such as pop, potato chips, kool aid, candy? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1311.			
(1) Are the homes, its premises and furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No			
Consider the following, in determining the above:			
(a) Rooms used by children well lighted and ventilated? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Porch, balcony, and stairway safe to protect children against falls (having handrails, steps in good repair, children's gates, or other sturdy barriers)? ___Yes ___No			
(c) Rooms used by children free from drafts and leaks? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Floors and wall kept clean? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1312.			
(1) Where the children can play indoors, is there at least 35 sq. ft. of play area per child present in the home? (Bathrooms and storage areas can't be used in determining square footage.) ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
List the approximate size of rooms where children play: Room ____ Size Number of children present in home? _____ (This includes all children, related and unrelated, who are under 18 years of age).			
Rule 1315. (1) Does each floor, used by children, have 2 exits? (Exits shall include doors, doorways, connecting hallways, stairways, operable windows, fire escapes, etc.) ____Yes ____No			
Does at least 1 exit from each floor level give a continuous and unobstructed way of travel to the outside at ground level? _____Yes _____No			
(2) If a window is used as an exit, is it easily opened (without tools), big enough and low enough for people to get out of quickly? ____Yes ____No If the window has a screen, can it be removed from the inside? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1317. Are each of the following out of reach of children: (a) Cleaning solutions, insecticides, and poisons? ___Yes___No			
(b) Sharp objects (knives, etc.)? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Flammable materials (matches, gasoline,)? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Bleaches and detergents? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Medical supplies? ____Yes ____No			
(f) Plastic bags? ____Yes ____No			
(g) Firearms? ____Yes ____No			
(h) Other similar materials such as mothballs, glues, etc.? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cuss
Rule 1318.			
(1) (a) Does the licensee have signed and notarized parental permission for emergency medical care for each child? _____Yes _____No			
Rule 1319.			
(1) (a) Has the licensee provided the Department with a current signed physician's statement indicating that the care-giver is mentally and physically capable of handling the added responsibility of child care? ____Yes ____No Date of Statement: _____ (18-65 years old - statement every 2 years; over 65 years-statement every year)			
Rule 1320.			
(2) Does the licensee have for each child enrolled the following information?			
(a) Child's full name and birthdate? _____Yes ____No			
(b) Name of parent? _____Yes _____No			
(c) Home address and telephone number of parent? ____Yes____No			
(d) Parent's business telephone number? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Name, address, and telephone number of family physician and/or hospital desired in an emergency? _____Yes _____No			
(f) Name, address and telephone number of another person to notify in case of an emergency? _____Yes _____No			

COMMENTS:

Spot Check Summary (use back if necessary) Note: Summary may include Recommendation and Follow-up Action:

DATE: WORKER'S SIGNATURE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Class, Norris, "Public Policy and Working Mothers: A Historical Analysis of the American Experience", Annual Lecture on Policy Issues, Unpublished Paper given at the School of Social Work, University of Southern California, 1972.

Costain, Lela B., Child Welfare: Policies and Practice, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Morgan, Gwen, Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children.

Public Acts for Michigan Sessions of 1899, 1913, 1919 and 1944, Lansing, Michigan.

STAFF RESOURCE LIBRARY
BUREAU OF REGULATORY SERVICES

1. Aaronson, May, Rosenfeld, Jean, Baby and Other Teachers, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1973
2. Abt Associates, Inc. Cost and Quality Issues for Operators, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972
3. Adair, Thelma, Eckstein, Esther, Parents and the Day Care Center, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Inc. 1969
4. Almy, Millie, The Early Childhood Educator at Work, McGray-Hill Book Co. 1975
5. Almy, Millie, Young Children's Thinking, Teachers College Press, 1966
6. Ambron, Sueann Robinson, Child Development, Rinehart Press, 1952
7. American Camping Association, 1976 Catalog of Selected Camping Pub. 1976
8. American Camping Association, Inc., Short Term Camping Guide, 1961
9. American Camping Association, Use of Resident Camps for School Programs, 1972
10. Anderson, James E. Emergence of the Modern Regulatory State, Public Affairs Press, 1962
11. Association for Childhood Education, Basic Propositions for Early Childhood Education, 1965
12. Association for Childhood Education International, Housing for Early Childhood Education, 1967-68
13. Atkinson, Jonathan, Day Care Costs: Day Care Accounting, 4-C Committee and the HUD 4-C Model Cities Project, 1973
14. Auld, Margaret E., Ehlke, Graceann, Guide to Camp Nursing, American Camping Association, 1974
15. Author's Collective, edited by Storefront Day Care Centers, Beacon Press, 1970
16. Baker, Katherine Read, Ed., Ideas that Work with Young Children, NAEYC, 1972
17. Baker, Katherine Read, Let's Play Outdoors, NAEYC, 1966
18. Baldwin, Alfred L., Theories of Child Development, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1967
19. Beer, Ethel S., Working Mothers and the Day Nursery, Lawrence Verry, Inc. 1970
20. Bergstrom, Joan L., Gold, Jane R. Focus on Programs for Infants & Toddlers, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1974
21. Bettelheim, Bruno, The Children of the Dream, Avon Pub. 1969
22. Bettelheim, Bruno, The Empty Fortress, The Free Press New York, 1967

23. Biber, Barbara, Challenges Ahead for Early Childhood Education, NAEYC, 1969

24. Biber, Barbara, Shapiro, Edna, Wickens, David, Promoting Cognitive Growth NAEYC, 1971

25. Black, Henry Campbell, M.A., Black's Law Dictionary, West Publishing Co. 1968

26. Bogardus, LaDonna, Camping with Retarded Persons, 1970

27. Boguslawski, Dorothy Beers, Guide for Establishing and Operating Day Care Centers for Young Children, Child Welfare League of America, Inc. 1975

28. Bonin, Garland L., Program Planning Aids for Day Care Centers, Louisiana Department of Public Welfare, 1972

29. Brady, Elizabeth H., McClain, Doris G., Assessing Day Care Needs and Services: Interview Procedures, The Rosenberg Foundation, 1972

30. Brazelton, T. Berry, M.D. Infants and Mothers - Differences in Development Delacorte Press, 1969

31. Brazelton, T. Berry, M.D. Toddlers and Parents, Delacorte Press, 1974

32. Breitbart, Vicki, The Day Care Book, New York, 1975

33. Carbonara, Nancy Trevorrow, Techniques for Observing Normal Child Behavior, University of Pittsburg Press, 1961

34. Carlson, Reynold & Ruth, Conservation for Camp Counselors, ACA, Inc. 1967

35. Chapman, Jane E., Comprehensive, Coordinated Child Care System, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1973

36. Chapman, Jane E. The Realities and Fantasies of Industry-Related Child Care Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1973

37. Cherry, Clare, Harkness, Barbara, Kuzma, Kay, Nursery School Management Guide, Fearon Pub. Co., 1973

38. Child Care Resource Center, A Family Day Care Study, Day Care & Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1972

39. Children's Defense Fund, School Suspensions are they Helping Children? 1975

40. Child Welfare League of America, The Changing Dimensions of Day Care, 1973

41. Child Welfare League of America, Campus Day Care: Issues and Resources, 1971

42. Child Welfare League of America, Child Welfare, 1975

43. Child Welfare League of America, Day Care a Preventive Service, 1964

44. Child Welfare League of America, CWLA Standards for Foster Family Service 1975

45. Child Welfare League of America, A Guide for Teacher Recording in Day Care Agencies, 1965

46. Child Welfare League of America, Preliminary Statement on Social Work Service for Children in Their Own Homes, 1968

47. Child Welfare League of America, Guidelines for Day Care Service, 1972

48. Child Welfare League of America, Standards for Day Care Service, 1960

49. Children's Bureau Publication Number 8, Infant Care, 1963

50. Children's Bureau Research Reports, On Rearing Infants and Young Children in Institutions, 1967

51. Church, Joseph, Language and the Discovery of Reality, Random House, 1961

52. Cohen, Monroe, D., A Lap to Sit on and Much More, Association for Childhood Education International, 1971

53. Cohen, Dorothy H., Stern, Virginia, Observing and Recording, Teachers College Press, 1958

54. Cole, Haas, Heller, Weinberger, Recipes for Fun, Par Project, 1970

55. Cole, Haas, Bushnell, Weinberger, I Saw A Purple Cow and 100 Other Recipes for Learning, Little, Brown & Co., 1972.

56. Cole, Haas, Heller, Weinberger, Recetas Para Divertirse, Par Project, 1970

57. Cole, Haas, Heller, Weinberger, More Recipes for Fun, 1972

58. Community Family Day Care Project, "I'm Not Just a Sitter...", Pacific Oaks College, 1971

59. Community Family Day Care Project, Open the Door...See the People, Pacific Oaks College, 1972.

60. Cooper, Frank E., State Administrative Law, Vol. 1, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1965

61. Cooper, Frank E., State Administrative Law, Vol. 2, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965

62. Costin, Lela B., Child Welfare: Policies and Practice, McGraw-Hill, 1972

63. Costin, Lela, Gruener, Jeannette, Licensing of Family Homes in Child Welfare, Wayne State University Press, 1965

64. DHEW Publication, Abstracts of State Day Care Licensing Requirements Part 2: Day Care Centers, 1971

65. Day, Barbara, Open Learning in Early Childhood, Macmillan Pub. Co., 1975

66. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. Proposal Review Checklist, 1973

67. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. Packet - Organizing Tools for Family Day Care Systems

68. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children, 1974

69. The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Alternatives in Quality Child Care, 1972

70. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Child Care Reprints IV Mothers in Paid Employment

71. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. A Compilation of Articles for Child Care Reprints Vol. I

72. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, A Compilation of Articles for Child Care Reprints Vol. II

73. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Directory for the Child Care Advocate

74. Day Care Child Development Council of America, How Children Grow, 1972

75. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, In Home Care Checklist, Family Day Care Home Checklist, Day Care Center Checklist, 1973

76. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Money for Migrant Children

77. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, The Next Step in the Struggle for Comprehensive Child Care

78. Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Standards and Costs of Day Care

79. The Day Care Consultation Service, Toward Comprehensive Child Care, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1974

80. Day Care Council of New York, Children at Risk, 1972

81. Day Care Council of New York, So You're Going to Run a Day Care Service! 1971

82. Davis, Kenneth Gulp, Administrative Law Text, West Publishing Co. 1972

83. Devaney, Kathleen, Developing Open Education in America, NAEYC, 1974

84. Diffendal, Elizabeth, Day Care for School-Age Children, UNCO, Inc.

85. Dinkmeyer, Don C. Child Development, The Emerging Self, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1965

86. Dittmann, Laura L., The Infants We Care For, NAEYC, 1973

87. Dittmann, Laura L. What We Can Learn From Infants, NAEYC, 1970

88. Early Childhood Report #13, Day Care Licensing Policies & Practices, 1975

89. The Education Commission of the States, Child Abuse and Nelgect: Alternatives for State Legislation, Education Commission of the States, 1973

90. The Education Commission of the States, Early Childhood Development, 1971

91. The Education Commission of the States, Establishing a State Office of Early Childhood Development, 1973

92. Evans, E. Belle, Shub, Bth, Weinstein, Marlene, Day Care, Beacon Press, 1971

93. Evans, E. Belle, Saia, George, E. Day Care for Infants, Beacon Press, 1972

94. Evans, E. Belle, Saia, George, Evans, Elmer, Designing a Day Care Center, Beacon Press, 1974

95. Ewald, Sara, Childhood and Adolescence, Random House, 1973

96. Fitzsimmons, Stephen, Rowe, Mary, A Study in Child Care 1970-71, Abt Associates Inc., 1971

97. Fogarino, Shirley, Reynolds, Amy, Careers in Child Care, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1974

98. Ford, Dr. Phyllis M., Your Camp & the Handicapped Child

99. Fraiberg, Selma, The Magic Years, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959

100. Freund, Ernst, Administrative Powers Over Persons and Property, Burt Franklin, New York, 1971

101. Friedberg, M. Paul, Berkeley, Ellen, Play and Interplay, The MacMillan Co., 1970

102. Friedberg, M. Paul, Playgrounds for City Children, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1969

103. Friends of Day Care Centers, Help! A Handbook for Child Care Workers, Tulsa Metropolitan Ministry, 1972

104. Friends of Perry Nursery School, The Scrap Book, Illustrated by Patricia J. Bangert, 1972

105. Furth, Hans G., Piaget and Knowledge, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969

106. Gardner, George E., The Emerging Personality, Delacorte Press, 1970

107. Gelhorn, Ernest, Administrative Law and Process, West Pub. Co. 1972

108. Gelhorn, Ernest, Administrative Law and Process in a Nut Shell, West Pub. Co. 1972

109. Gibson, Paul R. Camping Intergrouping: A Synthesis of Theory and Action, ACA 1974

110. Ginott, Dr. Haim G., Between Parent & Child, MacMillan Pub. Co., 1965

111. Goldsmith, Cornelia, Better Day Care for the Young Child, NAEYC, 1972

112. Goldstein, Joseph, Freud, Anna, Solnit, Albert, Beyond the Best Interests of the Child, MacMillan Pub. 1973

113. Goldstein, Joseph, Katz, Jay, The Family and the Law, Collier MacMillan Pub. 1965

114. Goodwin, Mary, Pollen, Gerry, Creative Food Experiences for Children, Center for Science in the Public Interest, 1974

115. Gordon, Ira J., Baby Learning Through Baby Play, St. Martin's Press, 1970

116. Gordon, Ira J. Guinagh, Barry, Jester, R. Emile, Child Learning Through Child Play, St. Martin's Press, 1972

117. Gordon, Ira J. On Early Learning, Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, 1971

118. The Great Atlantic and Pacific School Conspiracy, Doing Your Own School, Beacon Press, 1972

119. Greenblatt, Bernard, Eberhard, Lois, Children on Campus, Women's Bureau, 1973

120. Greenleaf, Phyllis, Liberating Young Children from Sex Roles, New England Press, 1972

121. Griffin, Louise, Multi-Ethnic Books for Young Children, NAEYC

122. Grotberg, Edith H., Day Care: Resources for Decisions, Office of Economic Opportunity

123. Hartup, Willard W. The Young Child, NAEYC, 1972

124. Hess, Robert D., Bear, Roberta Meyer, Early Education, Aldine-Atherton, 1968

125. Hewitt, Karen, Learning Materials Notebook, 1974

126. Hill, Myron G. Jr., Rossen, Howard M. Sogg, Wilton, Smith's Review Legal Gem Series Administrative Law, West Publishing Co., 1972

127. Hirsch, Elisabeth, The Block Book, NAEYC, 1974

128. Hirschbach, Ernest, Group Homes for Children, Canadian Council on Social Develop. 1965

129. Hirshen, Sanford, Ouye, Joe, The Infant Care Center, Sanford Hirshen & Partners 1973

130. Hoffman, Gertrude L. School Age Child Care, DHEW Pub.

131. Hoffman, Martin L., Hoffman, Lois Wladis, Review of Child Development Research Volume 1, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964

132. Hoffman, Martin and Lois, Review of Child Development Research, Volume 2 Russell Sage Foundation, 1966

133. Holt, John, Escape from Childhood, Random House, 1974

134. Honig, Alice S., Infant Development Problems in Intervention, Day Care and Child Development Council of America

135. Hurlock, Elizabeth B., Child Development, McGraw-Hill Series in Psychology, 1972

136. Hymes, James L. Jr., Early Childhood Education, NAEYC, 1969

137. Iise, Mattick, Makeshift Won't Do, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., 1972

138. Ingelman-Sundberg, Axel, Wirsen, Claes, A Child is Born, Delacorte Press, 1965

139. Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, A first step in education..Nursery School

140. Jones, Elizabeth, What is Music for Young Children? NAEYC, 1958

141. Journal of Public Social Services, Practice Forum, The Parent in the Shadows, 1970

142. Kellogg, Rhonda, Analyzing Children's Art, Mayfield Pub. Co. 1969

143. Keister, Mary Elizabeth, Ph.D., The Good Life for Infants and Toddlers, NAEYC, 1970

144. Kellogg, Elizabeth T., Hill, Dorothy M. Following through with Young Children, NAEYC, 1969

145. Kempe, C. Henry, Helfer, Ray, Helping the Battered Child and His Family, J.B. Lippincott Co., 1972

146. Keyserling, Mary Dublin, Windows on Day Care, National Council of Jewish Women, 1972

147. Kiester, Dorothy J., Who Am I? Durham, Learning Institute of North Carolina, 1973

148. Kohlmeier, Louis M., The Regulators, Harper & Row, 1969

149. Kritchevsky, Sybil, Prescott, Elizabeth, Walling, Lee, Planning Environments for Young Children Physical Space, NAEYC, 1969

150. LaCrosse, Robert E., Day Care for America's Children, Public Affairs Pamphlet, 1971

151. Landis, James M., The Administrative Process, Greenwood Press, 1974

152. Landreth, Catherine, Preschool Learning and Teaching, Harper & Row, 1972

153. Latimer, Bettye I. Starting Out Right, Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction, 1972

154. Leach, Luna Bowdoin, Interdisciplinary Team Consultation in Day Care Community Council of the Capitol Region, Inc., 1972

155. Leboyer, Frederick, Birth Without Violence, Alfred A. Knopf, 1976

156. Levine, James A. Hustling Resources for Day Care, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1974

157. Lichtenberg, Philip, Norton, Dolores, Cognitive and Mental Development in the First Five Years of Life, Public Health Service Pub., 1970

158. Lillie, David L., Parent Programs in Child Development Centers, Day Care and Child Development Council, Inc. 1972

159. Linden, Evelyn, An Introduction to Early Childhood Education, Franklin-Wright Settlements, Inc. 1965

160. Low, Seth, Spindler, Pearl G. Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in THE U.S., Children's Bureau Pub. 461, 1968

161. Lugo, James O., Hershey, Gerald L., Human Development, MacMillan Pub. 1974

162. Lundberg, Christina, Parent Involvement Staff Handbook, Mississippi Head Start Training Coordinating Council, 1972

163. McBride, Angela Barron, The Growth and Development of Mothers, Harper & Row, 1973

164. McCandless, Boyd R., Children Behavior and Development Second Edition, Dryden Press, Inc. 1967

165. McCarthy, Jan, May, Charles R., Providing the Best for Young Children, NAEYC, 1974

166. McSpadden, Lucia Ann, Developmental Curriculum A Total Approach, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America

167. McSpadden, Lucia Ann, Formative Evaluation, Headstart Day Care Center

168. McVickar, P., Imagination Key to Human Potential, NAEYC, 1972

169. Mattick, Ilse, Perkins, Frances J. Guidelines for Observation and Assessment: An Approach to Evaluating the Learning Environment of a Day Care Center, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972

170. Meyers, Thelma, Camping for Emotionally Disturbed Boys

171. Morgan, Gwen G., Regulations of Early Childhood Programs, The Day Care and Child Development Council, 1972

172. Mussen, Paul, Conger, John, Kagan, Jerome, Child Development and Personality, Harper & Row, 1974

173. NAEYC, Perspectives on Child Care, Day Care and Child Development Council, 1972

174. NAEYC, Day Care as a Child-Rearing Environment, 1972

175. NAEYC, Curriculum Is What Happens, 1970

176. NAEYC, The Significance of the Young Child's Motor Development, 1971

177. NAEYC, Play: The Child Strives Toward Self-Realization, 1971

178. NAEYC, Montessori in Perspective, 1966

179. National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Easter Seal Guide to Special Camping Programs, 1968

180. Nelson, Dalmas H., Administrative Agencies of the USA, Wayne State University Press, 1964

181. New Resources Staff, Labor's Stake in Child Care, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972

182. Northside Child Development Center 1972 Annual Report

183. Orem, R.C., Montessori, Her Method and the Movement, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974

184. Osmon, Fred Linn, Patterns for Designing Children's Centers, Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1971

185. Panero, Julius, Anatomy for Interior Designers, Whitney Library of Design, 1962

186. Phillips, John, The Origins of Intellect Piaget's Theory, W.H. Freeman and Co. 1969

187. Phillips, Michael, Haring, Barbara, Shyne, Ann, A Model for Intake Decisions in Child Welfare, CWLA, 1972

188. Phillips, Michael, Shyne, Ann, Sherman, Edmund, Haring, Barbara, Factors Associated with Placement Decisions in Child Welfare Research Center, CWLA, 1973

189. Pizzo, Peggy Daly, How Babies Learn to Talk, Georgia Appalacian Outreach Project, 1974

190. Pizzo, Peggy Daly, Operational Difficulties of Group Day Care, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972

191. Pizzo, Peggy Daly, The Infant Day Care Debate, Day Care and Child Development Council of America

192. Prescott, Elizabeth, Jones, Elizabeth, Kritchevsky, Sybil, NAEYC PACIFIC OAKS College, 1972

193. Prescott, Milich, Jones, The "Politics" of Day Care, NAEYC, 1972

194. Provence, Sally, M.D. Guide for the Care of Infants in Groups, CWLA, 1975

195. Ratliff, Patricia, Organizing to Coordinate Child Care Services, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1973

196. Read, Donald, Simon, Sidney, Humanistic Education Sourcebook, Prentice-Hall, 1975

197. Resources for Community Change, Demand for Day Care, 1974

198. Roberts, David, Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State, Archon Books, 1969

199. Roby, Pamela, Child Care-Who Cares? Basic Books, Inc. 1973

200. Rodney, Lynn, Ford, Phyllis, Camp Administration, The Ronald Press Company, 1971

201. Rood, Larry A. Parents and Teachers Together, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1970

202. Rowe, Richard, The Care and Education of Young Children, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1972

203. Rowe, Richard, Rowe, Mary, The Costs of Child Care; Money and Other Resources, The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972

204. Ruopp, Richard, O'Farrell, Brigid, Warner, David, Rowe, Mary, Freedman, Ruth, A Day Care Guide for Administrators, Teachers and Parents, The MIT Press, 1973

205. Rutherford, Frederick, W., You and Your Baby, New American Library, 1971

206. Sale, June Sonit, Final Report Community Family Day Care Project, Pacific Oaks College, 1973

207. Sale, June Solnit, "I'm Not Just a Babysitter", Children's Bureau, 1971

208. Sanoff, Henry and Joan, Hensley, Anderson, Learning Environments for Children, Day Care and Child Development Council of America

209. Schmidt, Ernest F., Camping Safety, American Camping Association, 1971

210. Schulman, Anne Shaaker, Absorbed in Living Children Learn, NAEYC, 1967

211. Seefeldt, Carol, A Curriculum for Child Care Centers, Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co. 1974

212. Sherman, Edmund, Neuman, Rencee, Shyne, Ann, Children Adrift in Foster Care

213. Smart, Mollie, Russell, School-Age Children, MacMillan Pub. Co. 1973

214. Smart, Mollie, Russell, Adolescents, MacMillan Pub. 1973

215. Smart, Mollie, Russell, Preschool Children, MacMillan Pub. 1973

216. Smart, Mollie, Russell, Infants Development and Relationships, MacMillan, 1973

217. Smith, A. Delafield, The Right to Life, College & University Press, 1955

218. Smothergill, Nancy L., Hartup, Willard, The Young Child, NAEYC, 1973

219. Southeaster Day Care Project, Planning Playgrounds for Day Care, 1973

220. Southeastern Day Care Project, A Cost Analysis System for Day Care Programs, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. 1971

221. Southeastern Day Care Project, How to do Day Care - Some Shared Experiences, 1974.

222. Sovern, Michael I., Legal Restraints on Racial Discrimination in Employment, The Twentieth Century Fund, N.Y. 1966

223. Spodek, Bernard, Teacher Education, NAEYC, 1974

224. Sponseller, Doris, Play as a Learning Medium, NAEYC, 1974

225. Staffieri, J. Robert Ph.D. What Do We Believe About Child Rearing?, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1973

226. Standards for Day Care Centers for Infants and Children Under 3 Years of Age, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1971

227. State of Illinois Gov's Conference, Day Care, 1971

228. Steinfels, Margaret O'Brien, Who's Minding the Children? Simon and Schuster, 1973

229. Stone, Jeannette Galambos, A Guide to Discipline, NAEYC, 1969

230. Stone, Jeannette Galambos, Play & Playgrounds, NAEYC, 1970

231. Sutton-Smith, Brian & Shirley, How to Play with Your Children (and when not to) Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1974

232. Taetzsch, Sandra, and Lyn, Pre-School Games and Activities, Fearon Pub., 1974

233. Tarnay, Elizabeth Doak, What Does the Nursery School Teacher Teach? NAEYC, 1965

234. Taylor, Barbara J., A Child Goes Forth, Brigham Young University Press, 1964

235. Texas State Dept. of Health, How to do it Book for Feeding Children in Group Care Centers, 1964

236. Upchurch, Beverly, Easy-to-do Toys and Activities for Infants and Toddlers, Infant Care Project, 1971

237. Webb, Kenneth B., Light from a Thousand Campfires, ACA, 1960

238. White, Burton L., The First Three Years of Life, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975

239. Wolins, Martin, Piliavin, Irving, Institution or Foster Family, Child Welfare League of America, 1964

240. Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Day Care Services: Industry's Involvement 1971

241. Yamamoto, Kaoru, The Child and His Image, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972

242. Young, Dennis, Nelson, Richard, Public Policy for Day Care of Young Children, Lexington Books, 1973

243. Zamoff, Richard B., Guide to the Assessment of Day Care Services and Needs at the Community Level, Urban Institute Paper, 1971

244. Vinter, Robert, Downs, George, Hall, John, Juvenile Corrections in the States: Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization, School of Social Work, U of M, 1976

245. "The Parent in the Shadows", Journal o ic Social Services, Vol. 1, No. 4, December, 1970.

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

OMB NO. 80-R0180

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element: HEW - Projects Grants Administration

2. Federal Grant No. or Other Identifying No.: DFAFS01-000CD-CB51D

3. Name and Address of Grantee Organization:
Michigan Department of Social Services
300 South Capitol Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48926

4. Employer Identification No.: 38-6000-134

5. Grantee Account No. or Identifying No.: 63-A898

6. Final Report: [XX] Yes [ ] No

7. Basis of Report: [XX] Cash [ ] Accrued Expenditures

8. Project Period (Month, Day, Year): FROM 7 | 1 | 19 | 74 TO 12 | 31 | 19 | 75

9. Report Period (Month, Day, Year): FROM 7 | 1 | 19 | 74 TO 12 | 31 | 19 | 75

10. STATUS OF FUNDS

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	TOTAL
a. Total outlays previously reported	-0-						-0-
b. Total program outlays this period	21,919.02						21,919.02
c. Less: Program income credits	-0-						-0-
d. Net program outlays this period	21,919.02						21,919.02
e. Total program outlays to date	21,919.02						21,919.02
f. Less: Non-Federal share of program outlays	-0-						-0-
g. Total Federal share of program outlays	21,919.02						21,919.02
h. Total unpaid obligations	-0-						-0-
i. Less: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations	-0-						-0-
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations	-0-						-0-
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations	21,919.02						21,919.02
l. Total Federal funds authorized	21,984.00						21,984.00
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds	64.98						64.98

11. Indirect Expense: a. Type of rate (Mark box)
[ ] Provisional [ ] Final
[ ] Predetermined [ ] Fixed

b. Rate

c. Base

d. Total amount

e. Federal share

12. REMARKS (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

13. CERTIFICATION — I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purposes set forth in the grant award documents.

Name and Title: Edward E. Armstrong
Director of Accounting

TELEPHONE: Area Code 517 | Number 373 | Ext. 1093

Signature of Authorized Official: Edward E. Armstrong

Date Report is Submitted: 7/15/76

HEW 601-T

∞